

1 Patrick S. Thompson (SBN 160804)
2 *pthompson@goodwinprocter.com*
3 Anna Hsia (SBN 234179)
4 *ahsia@goodwinprocter.com*
5 Audrey M. Lin (SBN 271671)
6 *alin@goodwinprocter.com*
7 **GOODWIN PROCTER LLP**
8 Three Embarcadero Center, 24th Floor
9 San Francisco, California 94111
10 Tel.: 415.733.6000
11 Fax: 415.677.9041

12 *Attorneys for Defendants*
13 *Twilio, Inc., a Delaware Corporation*

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
OAKLAND DIVISION

BRIAN GLAUSER, individually and on behalf
of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

TWILIO, INC., a Delaware corporation, and
GROUPME, INC., a Delaware corporation,

Defendants.

Case No. CV11-2584 PJH

**MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND
AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF TWILIO,
INC.'S MOTION TO DISMISS CLASS
ACTION COMPLAINT**

Date: October 12, 2011
Time: 9:00 a.m.
Courtroom: 3
Judge: Hon. Phyllis J. Hamilton

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT.....	1
II. SUMMARY OF RELEVANT FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS.	1
III. PLAINTIFF FAILS TO STATE A CLAIM AGAINST TWILIO.	2
A. The Complaint Must Meet Rule 8 Pleading Standards.	2
B. The Court Should Dismiss the Claims Because Twilio’s Role is Akin to That of a Common Carrier and Should Therefore Be Exempt from Liability.....	2
IV. IF THE COURT DECLINES TO DISMISS THE COMPLAINT AGAINST TWILIO, THE COURT SHOULD REFER THE MATTER TO THE FCC UNDER THE DOCTRINE OF PRIMARY JURISDICTION.....	5
A. Any Issues Related to Twilio Should Be Referred to the FCC.....	5
B. The FCC is Considering a Petition Regarding the Precise Issues in this Case...8	8
V. CONCLUSION.....	9

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**Page(s)****CASES**

<i>Albrecht v. Lund</i> , 845 F.2d 193 (9th Cir. 1988).....	5
<i>Ashcroft v. Iqbal</i> , 129 S. Ct. 1937 (2009)	2
<i>Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly</i> , 550 U.S. 544 (2007)	2
<i>Chicago Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, Inc. v. Craigslist, Inc.</i> , 519 F.3d 666 (7th Cir. 2008).....	5
<i>Clark v. Time Warner Cable</i> , 523 F.3d 1110 (9th Cir. 2008).....	9
<i>Coren v. Mobile Entertainment, Inc.</i> , No. C 08-05264 JF (PVT), 2009 WL 264744 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 4, 2009).....	5
<i>Davel Commc'ns, Inc. v. Qwest Corp.</i> , 460 F.3d 1075 (9th Cir. 2006).....	6, 9
<i>Hart v. Comcast of Alameda</i> , No. C 07-6350 PJH, 2008 WL 2610787 (N.D. Cal. June 25, 2008).....	9
<i>Jurin v. Google Inc.</i> , 695 F. Supp. 2d 1117 (E.D. Cal. 2010).....	4
<i>Kemp v. Int'l Business Machines Corp.</i> , No. C-09-4683 MHP, 2010 WL 4698490 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 8, 2010).....	2
<i>Kopff v. Battaglia</i> , 425 F. Supp. 2d 76 (D.D.C. 2006)	7
<i>Reit v. Yelp!</i> , 907 N.Y.S.2d 411 (N.Y. Sup. Ct. 2010)	4, 5
<i>Satterfield v. Simon & Schuster, Inc.</i> 569 F.3d 946, 952 (9th Cir. 2009).....	7
<i>Syntek Semiconductor Co. v. Microchip Tech., Inc.</i> , 307 F.3d 775 (9th Cir. 2002).....	6, 8
<i>United States v. Dish Network, L.L.C.</i> , No. 09-3073, 2011 WL 475067 (C.D. Ill. Feb. 4, 2011).....	6

1 **STATUTES**

2	47 U.S.C. § 151	6
3	47 U.S.C. § 153	3
4	47 U.S.C. § 227	1, 2
5	47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(2).....	6

6 **OTHER AUTHORITIES**

7	47 CFR 64.1200(f)(4).....	4
8	137 Cong. Rec. S18317-01, at 1 (1991).....	6
9	<i>In the Matter of Enforcement of Prohibitions Against the Use of Common Carriers for the</i>	
10	<i>Transmission of Obscene Materials,</i>	
11	2 FCC Rcd. 2819 (May 15, 1987).....	3
12	<i>In the Matter of Rules and Regulations Implementing the Telephone Consumer Protection</i>	
13	<i>Act of 1991,</i>	
14	7 FCC Rcd. 8752 (Oct. 16, 1992)	3
15	<i>In the Matter of Rules and Regulations Implementing the Telephone Consumer Protection</i>	
16	<i>Act of 1991,</i>	
17	Docket No. 02-278, FCC 03-153 (June 26, 2003)	6
18	<i>In the Matter of Rules and Regulations Implementing the Telephone Consumer Protection</i>	
19	<i>Act of 1991,</i>	
20	7 FCC Rcd. 8752 (Oct. 16, 1992)	7
21	<i>Petition for Declaratory Ruling Before the Federal Communications Commission, Club</i>	
22	<i>Texting, Inc. Petition for Declaratory Ruling that Text Broadcasters are not “Senders”</i>	
23	<i>of Text Messages Under § 227(b)(1) of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act,</i>	
24	Docket No. 02-278 (Aug. 25, 2009).....	8
25	<i>Public Notice, Consumer & Governmental Affairs Bureau Seeks Comment on Club</i>	
26	<i>Texting’s Petition for Declaratory Ruling Concerning the Telephone Consumer</i>	
27	<i>Protection Act Rules, Docket No. 02-278 (Nov. 9, 2009)</i>	8
28	<i>Rules and Regulations Implementing the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991, 68</i>	
	F.R. 44144-01 (July 25, 2003)	3, 4, 6, 7
	<i>Rules and Regulations Implementing the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991,</i>	
	19 FCC Rcd. 15927 (Aug. 12, 2004)	7

1 **I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT.**

2 Plaintiff seeks a class action to hold Twilio, Inc. (“Twilio”) liable for allegedly sending
3 unsolicited text messages in violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (“TCPA”),
4 alleging only that Twilio provided a service through which its customer sent text messages. The
5 Court should dismiss the Complaint.

6 The Court should dismiss the claims against Twilio with prejudice because plaintiff has not
7 and cannot allege a TCPA violation against Twilio. In contrast to the telemarketers and spammers
8 targeted by the TCPA, Twilio merely provides its customers a software platform that allows them
9 to send short message service (“SMS”) calls to telephone numbers specifically identified and
10 provided by Twilio’s customers. In this intermediary role, Twilio functions like common carriers
11 and fax broadcasters who are exempt from liability under the TCPA. As a general service
12 provider, Twilio may not be liable under the TCPA absent factual allegations that Twilio (1) was
13 heavily involved in controlling the content or recipients of the text messages or (2) actually knew
14 that its service was being used in violation of the TCPA. The Complaint contains no such factual
15 allegations, nor could plaintiff make a genuine allegation that Twilio played such a role. For those
16 reasons, the Complaint against Twilio should be dismissed with prejudice.

17 If the Court were to consider maintaining an action against Twilio, the Court should
18 instead refer this matter to the Federal Communications Commission (“FCC”) under the doctrine
19 of primary jurisdiction. Congress mandated the FCC to implement rules and regulations
20 governing the TCPA. And the FCC is currently considering a petition in which a Twilio
21 competitor requested a declaration to exempt companies like Twilio from liability under the
22 TCPA. Because the precise issue presented in this case is pending before the FCC, and the FCC
23 would be best-positioned to establish uniform TCPA guidelines, the Court should refer this matter
24 to the FCC if the matter is not dismissed.

25 **II. SUMMARY OF RELEVANT FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS.**

26 In this putative class action complaint, plaintiff Brian Glauser alleges violations of the
27 TCPA, codified at 47 U.S.C. § 227. Plaintiff alleges that, in April 2011, he received text messages
28 from a phone number “owned and/or operated” by Twilio and used by GroupMe. Complaint

1 (“Comp.”) ¶ 27. Plaintiff alleges receiving multiple text messages inviting him to be part of a
2 “GroupMe group.” Comp. ¶ 35.

3 Plaintiff alleges that GroupMe offers a service through which an individual or entity can
4 create a “group” and send text messages to multiple individuals at once. Comp. ¶ 10. To provide
5 this service, GroupMe acquired a telephone number from Twilio, and through that telephone
6 number, GroupMe sent text messages to plaintiff. Comp. ¶¶ 12-13. Plaintiff does not allege that
7 Twilio (a) controlled any of the content of the text messages; (b) controlled who should receive
8 any of the text messages; or (c) knew that the text messages sent to plaintiff were unlawful.

9 **III. PLAINTIFF FAILS TO STATE A CLAIM AGAINST TWILIO.**

10 **A. The Complaint Must Meet Rule 8 Pleading Standards.**

11 To survive a motion to dismiss, a complaint must state a “plausible” claim for relief.
12 *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 129 S. Ct. 1937, 1949-50 (2009). Plausibility requires “more than a sheer
13 possibility that a defendant has acted unlawfully”; rather the factual allegations must be sufficient
14 to move the claim “across the line from conceivable to plausible.” *Id.* at 1949, 1951 (quoting *Bell*
15 *Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)). Courts dismiss cases that rely on “a formulaic
16 recitation of the elements of a cause of action.”¹

17 **B. The Court Should Dismiss the Claims Because Twilio’s Role is Akin to That of** 18 **a Common Carrier and Should Therefore Be Exempt from Liability.**

19 This Court should dismiss the TCPA claim against Twilio with prejudice because plaintiff
20 does not, and cannot, allege a plausible claim. The Complaint contains no factual allegations that
21 would subject Twilio to liability under the TCPA.² As alleged in the Complaint, Twilio plays an

22 ¹ In addition to the grounds set forth in Section III.B, the Complaint should be dismissed because
23 a TCPA plaintiff must allege the phone number to which allegedly unlawful text messages were
24 sent. *See Coren v. Mobile Entertainment, Inc.*, No. C 08-05264 JF (PVT), 2009 WL 264744, at
25 *1 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 4, 2009) (granting Rule 12(e) motion where plaintiff did not plead the cell
phone number because, “[w]ithout the cell phone, [] Defendants cannot determine whether
Plaintiff is a valid customer and cannot frame a response”). Here, Plaintiff does not plead the
cell phone number for the calls at issue.

26 ² The TCPA imposes liability where an entity uses an “automatic telephone dialing system or an
27 artificial or prerecorded voice” to send an unsolicited text message. 47 U.S.C. § 227. As set
28 forth in GroupMe’s motion to dismiss, plaintiff does not allege facts sufficient to give rise to a
plausible inference that an automatic telephone dialing system was used. Conclusory assertions
based “upon information and belief” do not suffice. *Kemp v. Int’l Business Machines Corp.*,
No. C-09-4683 MHP, 2010 WL 4698490, at *4 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 8, 2010) (absent supporting

intermediary role akin to a common carrier by carrying messages created by others and routed to recipients identified by others. As discussed below, the FCC has consistently exempted “common carriers”³ from liability, absent specific factual circumstances, none of which are alleged here.

Common carriers include telephone carriers such as AT&T and Verizon, which are entities that enable customers to make telephone calls for a fee. They also include “fax broadcasters,” namely individuals or entities that send facsimiles on behalf of others for a fee. Under its regulations, the FCC exempts common carriers from liability unless they have a “high degree of involvement” or “actual notice” of the illegal use of their services. For example, in 1987, the FCC ruled that telephone carriers are immune from liability for illegal use of their services, unless there is a “high degree of involvement or actual notice of an illegal use and failure to take steps to prevent such transmissions.” *In the Matter of Enforcement of Prohibitions Against the Use of Common Carriers for the Transmission of Obscene Materials*, 2 FCC Rcd. 2819, 2820 (May 15, 1987). Skeptical of how a provider of telephone services could in fact ever be liable for illegal acts committed through those services, the FCC cited a California district court in stating that it would be “unlikely that a telephone common carrier will ever possess sufficient knowledge of an illegal use of its facilities to be held liable therefore under section 223(b).” *Id.* at 2820.

In 1992, as technology evolved, the FCC extended this common carrier immunity to fax broadcasters, again finding that “[i]n the absence of ‘a high degree of involvement or actual notice of an illegal use and failure to take steps to prevent such transmissions,’” common “carriers who simply provide transmission facilities that are used to transmit others’ unsolicited facsimile advertisements may not be held liable.” *In the Matter of Rules and Regulations Implementing the TCPA of 1991*, 7 FCC Rcd. 8752, 8779-80 (Oct. 16, 1992) (quoting 2 FCC Rcd. 2819, 2820 (May

factual allegations, conclusory assertions “upon information and belief” do not state a claim). Plaintiff’s allegation that Twilio has the “opportunity” to “send wireless spam to the thousands of phone numbers added by consumers” is similarly unsupported by factual allegations. Comp. ¶ 20. Nowhere in the Complaint does plaintiff allege that Twilio authored any text messages to plaintiff.

³ The FCC defines a “common carrier” as “any person engaged as a common carrier for hire, in interstate or foreign communication by wire or radio or interstate or foreign radio transmission of energy, except where reference is made to common carriers not subject to this chapter”. 47 U.S.C. § 153.

1 15, 1987)). The FCC reaffirmed this finding in 2003, reiterating that “if a common carrier is
2 merely providing the network over which a subscriber (a fax broadcaster or other individual,
3 business, or entity) sends an unsolicited facsimile message, that common carrier will not be liable
4 for the facsimile.” *Rules and Regulations Implementing the TCPA of 1991*, 68 F.R. 44144-01,
5 44169 (July 25, 2003). Because the party who actually provides the recipient fax numbers “is in
6 the best position to ensure that recipients have consented to receive the faxes,” that party “should
7 be liable for violations of the prohibition.” *Id.* at 44169. To clarify any remaining ambiguity, the
8 FCC defined a “facsimile broadcaster” to mean “a person or entity that transmits messages to
9 telephone facsimile machines on behalf of another person or entity for a fee.” *See* 47 CFR
10 64.1200(f)(4). Like telephone common carriers, absent a “high degree of involvement” or “actual
11 notice” of any illegal uses, these facsimile broadcasters are immune from liability under the
12 TCPA. The FCC specified that the “high degree of involvement” it contemplated existed in
13 situations where the fax broadcaster (1) controls the recipient lists; and/or (2) controls the content
14 of the advertisements. *See Rules and Regulations Implementing the Telephone Consumer*
15 *Protection Act (TCPA) of 1991*, 68 FR 44144-01, 44169 (July 25, 2003).

16 As alleged in the Complaint, Twilio operates exactly like telephone common carriers and
17 fax broadcasters. For a fee, Twilio merely provides a service whereby a customer can send text
18 messages to a specified recipient list. Plaintiff alleges that (1) a GroupMe customer provides the
19 recipient telephone numbers to GroupMe, and (2) Twilio merely transmits text messages
20 developed and sent by others using the GroupMe service. *Comp.* ¶¶ 13-14. In other words,
21 Plaintiff alleges only that Twilio provided the software platform and a telephone number from
22 which these text messages could be transmitted. *See Comp.* ¶ 13. By this standard, plaintiff
23 cannot state a claim against Twilio absent allegations that Twilio had a “high degree of
24 involvement” in the text messages or had “actual notice” of the TCPA violations.

25 Here, the Complaint alleges only that Twilio acted as a mere conduit through which text
26 messages could be sent. Plaintiff does not allege that Twilio determined who would receive any
27 text message. Plaintiff does not allege that Twilio even read the content of any text messages sent
28

1 to plaintiff, much less controlled the content of those messages.⁴ Absent such factual allegations,
 2 no plausible claim lies against Twilio. Twilio submits that plaintiff would have no good faith
 3 basis to assert such allegations. Accordingly, the Complaint should be dismissed with prejudice.
 4 *See Albrecht v. Lund*, 845 F.2d 193, 195 (9th Cir. 1988) (dismissing original complaint without
 5 leave to amend).

6 **IV. IF THE COURT DECLINES TO DISMISS THE COMPLAINT AGAINST**
 7 **TWILIO, THE COURT SHOULD REFER THE MATTER TO THE FCC UNDER**
 8 **THE DOCTRINE OF PRIMARY JURISDICTION.**

9 **A. Any Issues Related to Twilio Should Be Referred to the FCC.**

10 If the Court declines to dismiss the Complaint against Twilio, any issues related to Twilio
 11 would fall squarely within the purview of the FCC. Plaintiff alleges Twilio is liable under the
 12 TCPA for providing the software platform that enabled GroupMe to send allegedly unsolicited
 13 text messages. *See* Comp. ¶ 49. But the TCPA is silent as to whether software application
 14 platform providers that merely provide the platform for text messages are liable under the TCPA,
 15 or whether they are exempt as a “common carrier.” The FCC is best-positioned to clarify this
 16 ambiguity.

17 Under the doctrine of primary jurisdiction, a court may “determine that the initial
 18 decision[-]making responsibility should be performed by the relevant agency rather than the
 19 courts.” *Syntek Semiconductor Co. v. Microchip Tech., Inc.*, 307 F.3d 775, 780 (9th Cir. 2002)
 20 (referring matter to the Register of Copyrights under the primary jurisdiction doctrine). This is
 21 especially appropriate in cases that present important “policy concerns or issues requiring uniform

22 ⁴ Common carrier immunity exists in analogous contexts as well. In *Jurin v. Google Inc.*, 695 F.
 23 Supp. 2d 1117 (E.D. Cal. 2010), the court dismissed Lanham Act claims against Google in
 24 connection with advertisements on Google. The court found that Google was exempt from
 25 liability because Google did not provide the actual content of the allegedly infringing
 26 advertisements. *Id.* at 1123. In *Reit v. Yelp!*, 907 N.Y.S.2d 411 (N.Y. Sup. Ct. 2010), the court
 27 granted Yelp’s motion to dismiss claims alleging violations of the Federal Communications
 28 Decency Act based on reviews posted on Yelp. The court held that Yelp was a mere service
 provider and could not be liable for content provided by others. *Id.* at 413-14. And in *Chicago
 Lawyers’ Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, Inc. v. Craigslist, Inc.*, 519 F.3d 666, 668 (7th
 Cir. 2008), the court affirmed judgment on the pleadings where plaintiff alleged that Craigslist
 violated Federal Housing Administration anti-discrimination rules. The court held that
 Craigslist could not be liable because it did not “make [] or publish any discriminatory
 advertisement, text message, or conversation,” and compared Craigslist to courier services that
 “do not read the documents inside packages.” *Id.* at 668.

1 resolution.” *Davel Commc’ns, Inc. v. Qwest Corp.*, 460 F.3d 1075, 1086-89 (9th Cir. 2006). Such
 2 a case exists here. The TCPA involves important policy issues related to protecting the rights of
 3 consumers in connection with tools of communication, *e.g.*, telephone, facsimile, and Internet.
 4 Congress intended the TCPA to be applied and administered uniformly. *See Rules and*
 5 *Regulations Implementing the TCPA of 1991*, 68 F.R. 44144-01, 44155 (July 25, 2003); *see also*
 6 *Report and Order, In the Matter of Rules and Regulations Implementing the Telephone Consumer*
 7 *Protection Act (TCPA) of 1991*, Docket No. 02-278, FCC 03-153, ¶ 83 (June 26, 2003) (“we
 8 believe that it was the clear intent of Congress generally to promote a uniform regulatory scheme
 9 under which telemarketer would not be subject to multiple, conflicting regulations.”) (citing 137
 10 Cong. Rec. S18317-01, at 1 (1991) (remarks of Sen. Pressler) (discussing the TCPA and stating
 11 that “[t]he Federal Government needs to act now on uniform legislation to protect consumers.”)).

12 To determine whether it is appropriate to apply the doctrine of primary jurisdiction, courts
 13 traditionally evaluate four factors: “(1) whether the question at issue is one within the
 14 conventional experience of judges or whether it involves technical or policy considerations within
 15 the agency’s particular field of expertise; (2) whether the question at issue is particularly within
 16 the agency’s discretion; (3) whether there exists a substantial danger of inconsistent ruling; and (4)
 17 whether a prior application to the agency has been made.” *See United States v. Dish Network,*
 18 *L.L.C.*, No. 09-3073, 2011 WL 475067, at *2 (C.D. Ill. Feb. 4, 2011) (citing *Davel Commc’ns*, 460
 19 F.3d at 1086-87). Applied to the present case, the Court should conclude that the issue presented
 20 in plaintiff’s complaint should be referred to the FCC for resolution. First, the TCPA is an issue
 21 within the FCC’s particular field of expertise, with Congress specifically tasking the FCC to issue
 22 rulings to implement the TCPA. 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(2) (requiring the FCC to “prescribe
 23 regulations to implement” the TCPA); *see also* 47 U.S.C. § 151 (establishing FCC and charging it
 24 with task of regulating interstate communications).

25 Second, plaintiff seeks to impose TCPA liability on a software application platform
 26 provider that merely provides transmission facilities used by others to transmit text messages.
 27 Whether such an entity enjoys TCPA immunity as a “common carrier” is an issue particularly
 28

1 suited for resolution by the FCC.⁵

2 Third, telephone calls, facsimiles, and the Internet span the entire nation, indeed the entire
3 globe, making the TCPA an issue of national reach and scope. Were this Court to issue a ruling
4 on the matter, there would be a high risk of conflicting results should the FCC issue a rulemaking.

5 Lastly, the FCC has already received a petition from a text message carrier company
6 seeking a declaratory ruling that it is a common carrier and thus not liable under the TCPA, a
7 petition which the FCC has taken under submission.⁶ This petition remains pending and is ripe for
8 FCC rulemaking. The FCC previously considered similar issues regarding facsimile common
9 carriers and found them to be exempt from liability under the TCPA, provided the carrier had no
10 content control or actual knowledge of illegal activity. *See In the Matter of Rules and Regulations*
11 *Implementing the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991*, 7 FCC Rcd. 8752, 8779-80, ¶ 54
12 (Oct. 16, 1992) (quoting 2 FCC Rcd. 2819, 2820 (May 15, 1987)) (“In the absence of ‘a high
13 degree of involvement or actual notice of an illegal use and failure to take steps to prevent such
14 transmissions,’” common “carriers who simply provide transmission facilities that are used to
15 transmit others’ unsolicited facsimile advertisements may not be held liable [under the TCPA]”).
16 Applying the FCC’s ruling, courts have exempted facsimile common carriers from TCPA liability.
17 *Kopff v. Battaglia*, 425 F. Supp. 2d 76, 92 (D.D.C. 2006) (stating that fax broadcasters who
18 operate like common carriers are not liable under the TCPA in the absence of involvement in the
19 content or actual notice of illegal activity).

20 Because the FCC has not explicitly ruled upon the question of whether text message
21 platform providers are analogous to facsimile common carriers and should be similarly exempt
22 from liability under the TCPA, this case is appropriate for transfer to the FCC under the doctrine

23
24 ⁵ In fact, Plaintiff’s entire case arises out of the FCC carrying out its duty to define the scope of
25 the TCPA. In 2003, the FCC ruled that the TCPA’s definition of “call” would include “both
26 voice calls and text calls.” *See Rules and Regulations Implementing the TCPA of 1991*, 68 F.R.
27 44144-01, 44165 (July 25, 2003); *see also Rules and Regulations Implementing the Telephone*
28 *Consumer Protection Act of 1991*, 19 FCC Rcd. 15927, 15933 (Aug. 12, 2004). Deferring to
the FCC’s rulemaking authority, the Ninth Circuit in *Satterfield v. Simon & Schuster, Inc.*
thereafter applied the FCC rulemaking to find that the TCPA covers text messages. 569 F.3d
946, 952 (9th Cir. 2009).

⁶ The petition, filed by Club Texting, Inc., is discussed in detail in the next section, Sec. IV.B.

1 of primary jurisdiction. *See Syntek Semiconductor Co.*, 307 F.3d at 782 (holding that application
 2 of the primary jurisdiction doctrine is appropriate where the “case requires the resolution of an
 3 issue within the jurisdiction of an administrative body exercising statutory and comprehensive
 4 regulatory authority over a national activity that requires expertise and uniformity in
 5 administration.”).

6 **B. The FCC is Considering a Petition Regarding the Precise Issues in this Case.**

7 The exact issue presented in this case—whether a text message service provider is a
 8 common carrier and exempt from liability under the TCPA—is already under submission before
 9 the FCC. On August 25, 2009, Club Texting, Inc. (“Club Texting”) filed a petition to the FCC
 10 seeking a declaratory ruling “that, consistent with the treatment of fax broadcasters, text
 11 broadcasters are not ‘senders’ of text messages under [the TCPA].” *See Petition for Declaratory*
 12 *Ruling Before the Federal Communications Commission, Club Texting, Inc. Petition for*
 13 *Declaratory Ruling that Text Broadcasters are not “Senders” of Text Messages Under § 227(b)(1)*
 14 *of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act*, Docket No. 02-278, at 1 (Aug. 25, 2009). Request for
 15 Judicial Notice (“RJN”), Ex. 1. Club Texting defined a “text broadcaster” as a person or entity
 16 that transmits SMS text messages to mobile telephones on behalf of another person or entity for a
 17 fee. *Id.* at 1 n.1. Club Texting reasoned that “[t]ext broadcasters act neither as the sender or
 18 recipient of text messages, but rather as an intermediary and conduit operating a platform that
 19 enables message delivery,” and “[i]n light of the functional equivalence between text broadcasting
 20 and fax broadcasting, the [Federal Communications] Commission should clarify that text
 21 broadcasters, like fax broadcasters, are not ‘senders’ of text messages under the TCPA.” *Id.* at 1.

22 In response, the FCC issued a public notice seeking public comments. *See Public Notice,*
 23 *Consumer & Governmental Affairs Bureau Seeks Comment on Club Texting’s Petition for*
 24 *Declaratory Ruling Concerning the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (TCPA) Rules*, Docket
 25 No. 02-278 (Nov. 9, 2009). RJN, Ex. 2. The petition is currently under submission and the FCC
 26 has not yet issued a ruling.

27 The Club Texting petition squarely addresses whether Twilio may be liable under the
 28 TCPA. In such situations, where an agency’s pending decision applies to the exact issue presented

1 in the litigation, primary jurisdiction is especially applicable. *See Hart v. Comcast of Alameda*,
 2 No. C 07-6350 PJH, 2008 WL 2610787, at *2 (N.D. Cal. June 25, 2008) (holding the FCC had
 3 primary jurisdiction because two petitions had been filed on the precise issue before the court, and
 4 the FCC has announced it would seek public comment); *Clark v. Time Warner Cable*, 523 F.3d
 5 1110, 1113-14 (9th Cir. 2008) (holding that the FCC had primary jurisdiction over the plaintiff's
 6 claim because the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking sought comment on the precise issue addressed
 7 before the court); *see also Davel Commc'ns*, 460 F.3d at 1090 ("It is precisely the purpose of the
 8 primary jurisdiction doctrine to avoid the possibility of conflicting rulings by courts and agencies
 9 concerning issues within the agency's special competence.").

10 Thus, if the Court does not dismiss the claims against Twilio pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6), the
 11 Court should exercise its discretion under the primary jurisdiction doctrine and refer the matter to
 12 the FCC because the issue presented in this action satisfies the four factors enumerated in *Davel*
 13 *Communications*, and because the precise issue at hand is already being considered by the FCC.

14 **V. CONCLUSION.**

15 For the foregoing reasons, this Court should dismiss all claims against Twilio with
 16 prejudice.

17 Dated: August 25, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

18 By: /s/ Patrick S. Thompson

Patrick S. Thompson
 pthompson@goodwinprocter.com

19 Anna Hsia
 ahsia@goodwinprocter.com

20 Audrey M. Lin
 alin@goodwinprocter.com

21 **GOODWIN PROCTER LLP**

22 Three Embarcadero Center, 24th Floor
 San Francisco, California 94111

23 Tel.: 415.733.6000

24 Fax: 415.677.9041

25 *Attorneys for Defendants*
Twilio, Inc., a Delaware Corporation

PROOF OF SERVICE

I, Randolph Roque, declare:

I am employed in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action. My business address is 601 South Figueroa Street, 41st Floor, Los Angeles, California 90017.

On August 25, 2011, I served the following documents by placing a true copy thereof in a sealed envelope(s) on the persons below as follows:

**MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF MOTION BY
TWILIO, INC. TO DISMISS CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT**

Sean Patrick Reis
EDELSON MCGUIRE, LLP
30021 Tomas Street, Suite 300
Rancho Santa Margarita, CA 92688

Counsel for Plaintiff *BRIAN GLAUSER*
Tel. 949-459-2124
Fax. 949-459-2123
E-Mail: sreis@edelson.com

Christopher L. Dore
Jay Edelson
Rafey Sarkis Balabanian
EDELSON MCGUIRE, LLC
350 North LaSalle Street, Suite 1300
Chicago, IL 60654

Counsel for Plaintiff *BRIAN GLAUSER*
Tel. 312-589-6370
Fax. 312-589-6378
E-Mail: cdore@edelson.com
E-Mail: jedelson@edelson.com
E-Mail: rbalabanian@edelson.com

Renuka Rebecca George
WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI
650 Page Mill Road
Palo Alto, CA 94304

Counsel for Defendant *GROUPME, INC.*
Tel. 650-493-9300
Fax. 650-565-5100
E-Mail: RGeorge@wsgr.com

Gerard M. Stegmaier
WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI
1700 K. Street, NW, 5th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20006-3817

Counsel for Defendant *GROUPME, INC.*
Tel: 202-973-8800
Fax: 202-973-8899
E-Mail: gstegmaier@wsgr.com

Tonia Maria Ouellette Klausner
WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI
1301 Avenue of the Americas, 40th Floor
New York, NY 10019-6022

Counsel for Defendant *GROUPME, INC.*
Tel: 212-999-5800
Fax: 212-999-5899
E-Mail: tklausner@wsgr.com

☐ (MAIL) I placed the envelope for collection and mailing, following our ordinary business practices. I am readily familiar with this firm's practice for collecting and processing correspondence for mailing. On the same day that correspondence is placed for collection and mailing, it is deposited in the ordinary course of business with the United States Postal Service, in a sealed envelope with postage fully prepaid. I am a resident or employed in the county where the mailing occurred. The envelope or package was placed in the mail at San Francisco, California.

- 1 ☒ (CM/ECF Electronic Filing) I caused the above document(s) to be transmitted to the
 2 office(s) of the addressee(s) listed above by electronic mail at the e-mail address(es) set
 3 forth above pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P.5(d)(1). "A Notice of Electronic Filing (NEF) is
 4 generated automatically by the ECF system upon completion of an electronic filing. The
 5 NEF, when e-mailed to the e-mail address of record in the case, shall constitute the proof
 6 of service as required by Fed.R.Civ.P.5(d)(1). A copy of the NEF shall be attached to
 7 any document served in the traditional manner upon any party appearing pro se."
- 8 ☐ (EXPRESS MAIL) I placed the envelope for collection and mailing, following our
 9 ordinary business practices. I am readily familiar with this firm's practice for collecting
 10 and processing Express Mail for mailing. On the same day that Express Mail is placed
 11 for collection and mailing, it is deposited in the ordinary course of business with the
 12 United States Postal Service, in a post office, mailbox, sub-post office, substation, mail
 13 chute, or other like facility regularly maintained by the United States Postal Service for
 14 receipt of Express Mail.
- 15 ☐ (OVERNIGHT DELIVERY) I deposited in a box or other facility regularly maintained
 16 by Federal Express, an express service carrier, or delivered to a courier or driver
 17 authorized by said express service carrier to receive documents, a true copy of the
 18 foregoing document in sealed envelopes or packages designated by the express service
 19 carrier, addressed as stated above, with fees for overnight delivery paid or provided for.
- 20 ☐ (MESSENGER SERVICE) I served the documents by placing them in an envelope or
 21 package addressed to the persons at the addresses listed and provided them to a
 22 professional messenger service for service. A separate Personal Proof of Service
 23 provided by the professional messenger service will be filed under separate cover.
- 24 ☐ (FACSIMILE) Based on an agreement of the parties to accept service by fax
 25 transmission, I faxed the documents to the persons at the fax numbers listed. No error
 26 was reported by the fax machine that I used. A copy of the record of the fax
 27 transmission, which I printed out, is attached.
- 28 ☐ (E-MAIL or ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION) Based on a court order or an agreement
 of the parties to accept service by e-mail or electronic transmission, I caused the
 documents to be sent to the persons at the e-mail addresses listed. I did not receive,
 within a reasonable time after the transmission, any electronic message or other
 indication that the transmission was unsuccessful.

I declare under penalty of perjury that I am employed in the office of a member of the bar
 of this Court at whose direction this service was made and that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on August 25, 2011, at Los Angeles, California.

Randolph Roque
 (Type or print name)


 (Signature)